

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Sterilized after Packaging" was false and misleading when applied to an article that was not sterile.

On May 5, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgment of forfeiture was entered and the product was ordered delivered to the United States Detention Farm at Milan, Mich., after it had been ascertained that the bandages would be properly sterilized before being used and that the prison hospital was equipped to sterilize them.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**27398. Misbranding of Wil-Du Rheumatism and Gout Medicine. U. S. v. 25 Bottles of Wil-Du Rheumatism and Gout Medicine. Default decree of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. no. 39341. Sample no. 34973-C.)**

This product contained alcohol in excess of the amount declared and its label bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative or therapeutic effects.

On April 6, 1937, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 bottles of Wil-Du Rheumatism and Gout Medicine at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about August 1 and December 30, 1936, by the Wil-Du Medicine Co., from Woodbury, N. J., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended.

Analysis of a sample showed that the article consisted essentially of alcohol (67 percent by volume), water, and extracts of plant drugs including senna.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statements "Rheumatism and Gout Medicine A Positive Relief for Chronic and Acute Rheumatism and Gout Will relieve \* \* \* if directions are followed. [design of invalid] \* \* \* This preparation acts on all organs of the human body and assists nature in throwing off morbid substances that cause Acute and Chronic Rheumatism and Gout", regarding its curative and therapeutic effects, appearing on the bottle label, were false and fraudulent. It was alleged to be misbranded further in that the statement on the label, "Alcohol 50 pct", was false and misleading since it did not contain 50 percent of alcohol but did contain a greater amount.

On May 4, 1937, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and the product was ordered destroyed.

M. L. WILSON, *Acting Secretary of Agriculture.*

**27399. Misbranding of Vi-Go-Ra Olive Oil Hair Tonic. U. S. v. 21 Units of Vi-Go-Ra Olive Oil Hair Tonic (and 1 other seizure action against the same product). Default decrees of condemnation and destruction. (F. & D. nos. 39342, 39628. Sample nos. 20550-C, 20845-C.)**

The label of this product bore false and fraudulent representations regarding its curative or therapeutic effects. It also conveyed the impression that the article contained an appreciable amount of olive oil; whereas it contained not more than a trace of, if any, olive oil. The product contained undeclared alcohol.

On April 6 and May 20, 1937, the United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court libels praying seizure and condemnation of 21 units, each containing one 8-ounce and two 16-ounce bottles of Vi-Go-Ra Olive Oil Hair Tonic, at Boston, Mass., and 19 units and 6 separate 16-ounce bottles of the same product, at New Bedford, Mass., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce from Providence, R. I., in part on or about August 7, 1936, by the Vi-Go-Ra Co., and in part on or about April 10, 1937, by the Rhode Island Barber Supply Co., Inc., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: "The Vi-Go-Ra Co., Providence, R. I."

Analyses showed that the article consisted essentially of alcohol (approximately 77 percent by volume), castor oil, a sulphonated oil, water, and a coloring material. It contained not more than a trace of, if any, olive oil.

It was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Olive Oil" on the label was false and misleading when applied to an article that contained not more than a trace of, if any, olive oil; in that the label failed to bear a statement of the quantity or proportion of alcohol contained in the article; and in that the